## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

RIGHT TO I	JFE OF	MICHIGAN	[etal

Plaintiffs,		
Tidilettis,		Case No. 1:23-cv-1189
V.		HONORABLE PAUL L. MALONEY
GRETCHEN WHITMER, et al.,		TIOTORIABLE TROP E. WILLOTVET
Defendants.		
	/	

## ORDER DISMISSING MOTION TO DISMISS AS MOOT

On January 30, 2024, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1) and (6) (ECF No. 17). On February 20, 2024, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint as a matter of course pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1) (ECF No. 23) When filed, an amended complaint supersedes the original complaint, which becomes a nullity. *See Drake v. City of Detroit*, 266 F.App'x 444, 448 (6th Cir. 2008); *Klyce v. Ramirez*, 852 F.2d 568, 1988 WL 74155, at \* 3 (6th Cir. July 19, 1998) (per curiam) (unpublished table opinion) (collecting cases from other circuits). An amended complaint filed after a motion to dismiss has been filed renders the motion to dismiss moot. *See Bancoult v. McNamara*, 214 F.R.D. 5, 13 (D.D.C. 2003) ("Because the original complaint now is superseded by the amended complaint, the court denies without prejudice all pending motions pertaining to the original complaint."). Accordingly, the motion to dismiss the complaint (ECF No. 17) is DISMISSED AS MOOT.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.